REMARKS

The paragraph numbering of the Office Action will be used.

Paragraph 2

Claims 1-29 were rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting, with reference to applicants' patent 6,173,210. It was indicated that the rejection could be overcome by the filing of a terminal disclaimer.

A Terminal Disclaimer is enclosed. Entry thereof and reconsideration of the rejection of claims 1-29 based on double patenting are respectfully requested.

Paragraph 4

Claim 30 was rejected under Section 102(b) as being anticipated by US patent 5,367,622 ("Coggins").

Claim 30 has been canceled.

Paragraph 5

Paragraph 5 makes reference to prior art made of record and not relied upon.

No form PTO-892 for the present application was included with the Office Action or received by applicant. For completion of applicants' file, the Examiner is requested to provide a copy of a form PTO-892 listing the prior art referred to.

Entry and consideration of this Amendment and the Terminal Disclaimer, reconsideration of the rejection of claims 1-29, and allowance of claims 1-29 are requested.

This application is considered to be in condition for allowance, which action is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Signed: July 13, 2004

Kenneth P. Robinson Attorney for Applicant

Reg. No.: 20,056

Tel. No.: (631) 385-3255

474 New York Avenue Huntington, NY 11743